

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Initially, the courtesies extended by Examiners Tran and Vigushin during the personal interview conducted on December 17, 2003, are greatly appreciated.

During the interview, Applicant's undersigned representative explained why claim 21, as pending at that time, was not believed to be anticipated by Kudoh et al. Examiners Tran and Vigushin expressed that this claim is properly rejected as being anticipated by Kudoh et al., because the phrase "an electrode in said recess and spaced from said lateral side" is broad enough to be read on the arrangement of any one the electrodes 26-31 of Kudoh et al.

Next, the rejection of claim 33 was discussed, and Applicant's undersigned representative explained why the subject matter of this claim is not taught or suggested by Kudoh et al. Specifically, because the arc-like terminals 4 of Figure 1A, and terminals 26-31 of Figure 4A, are formed by cutting through a hole with an inner wall of the hole having a conductor film thereon, the conductor film will be co-extensive with a surface that is defined by the cut. In other words, at least a portion of the electrode or conductor film will be co-planar with this surface, which is contrary to what is required by claim 33. Examiners Tran and Vigushin agreed that the subject matter of claim 33 is not taught or suggested by Kudoh et al., and expressed that if claim 33 were combined with claim 21, then this new claim would define around Kudoh et al.

Accordingly, by the current Amendment, the subject matter of claim 33 has been incorporated into independent claim 21, such that it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 21 is allowable over Kudoh et al.

With regard to independent claims 34 and 39, Applicant's undersigned representative explained why these claims are also believed to not be anticipated by Kudoh et al. Specifically, the final "removing" operation as recited in each of claims 34 and 39 is not taught or suggested by Kudoh et al. In this regard, Kudoh et al. discloses cutting through a hole with a conductor film formed on the inner wall of the hole, without first removing a portion of the conductor film. Examiners Tran and Vigushin agreed that claims 34 and 39, as pending at the time of the interview, are not taught or

suggested by Kudoh et al. Accordingly, claims 34 and 39 have not been amended and should now be allowed.

Claim 27 has also been amended for clarification purposes as discussed during the interview.

Also during the interview, proposed drawing amendments for Figure 13 were briefly discussed with regard to the drawing objection and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, as expressed in the Office Action mailed September 4, 2003. No agreement was reached with regard to whether these proposed drawing amendments would overcome the objection and rejections; however, it was agreed that the objection and rejections would be withdrawn if the proposed drawing amendments are sufficient to overcome them. Accordingly, in view of the following discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed drawing amendments as presented during the interview, and presented here as a replacement formal drawing, are sufficient to overcome the objection to the drawings and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, reference is made to the new formal drawing for Figure 13, wherein reference numeral "162" corresponds to the internal layer, reference numeral "72" corresponds to the pattern, and reference numeral 73 corresponds to the "land" as recited in claim 24. Additionally, the substitute specification at page 9, in paragraphs [0043] and [0044] have been amended in accordance with new the formal drawing for Figure 13. In view of the above, since each of the features as recited in claim 24 is shown in Figure 13, it is respectfully submitted that the drawing objection should not be maintained.

Similarly, with regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, rejections of claim 24, reference is made to the new formal drawing for Figure 13, wherein electrode 65 is shown to be connected to land 73, and land 73 is shown to be connected pattern 72 of the internal layer 162. Also, claim 24 has been amended by re-arranging the terms thereof and deleting therefrom the term "thereon" so as to avoid any possible confusion as to what is intended by this claim. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, rejections of claim 24 also should not be maintained.

Also, a new formal drawing for Figure 12 is provided, which identifies the electrode as reference numeral "65", and identifies the substrate as reference numeral "62".

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Junichi KIMURA

By: 

Joseph M. Gorski
Registration No. 46,500
Attorney for Applicant

JMG/edg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 31, 2003